UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/038,148	01/03/2002	Jay R. Anderson	41037.P003	7452

7590	10/06/2005

Detto Technologies
14320 NE 21st Street
Suite 11
Bellevue, WA 98007

EXAMINER
PANNALA, SATHYANARAYA R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2164	

DATE MAILED: 10/06/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *12 July 2005*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-23 and 44-68* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-5,7,17-21,44-48,50,60-64,67 and 68* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) *6,8-16,22,23,49,51-59,65 and 66* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *03 January 2002* is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☒ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>8/19/2002</u>.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1.   Claims 24-43 and 69-94 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on 7/12/2005.

2.   Applicant's election without traverse of claims 1-23 and 44-68 in Group I, in the reply filed on 7/12/2005 is acknowledged. Claims 1-23 and 44-68 are pending in this Office Action.

Priority

3.   Applicant is claiming the benefit of priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(e) since a U.S. Provisional Application No. 60/259,998 is filed on 1/5/2001. So, the examiner honors the priority as per statutory law.

Drawings

4.   The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: reference number 116 on page 2, paragraph [0026]. Corrected drawing

sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

5.   The summary of the invention is not included in the specification. A summary is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed. See MPEP §§ 608.01(d).

The following guidelines illustrate the preferred layout for the specification of a utility application. These guidelines are suggested for the applicant's use.

Arrangement of the Specification

As provided in 37 CFR 1.77(b), the specification of a utility application should include the following sections in order. Each of the lettered items should appear in upper case, without underlining or bold type, as a section heading. If no text follows the section heading, the phrase "Not Applicable" should follow the section heading:

(a) TITLE OF THE INVENTION.
(b) CROSS-REFERENCE TO RELATED APPLICATIONS.

(c) STATEMENT REGARDING FEDERALLY SPONSORED RESEARCH OR
       DEVELOPMENT.
(d) INCORPORATION-BY-REFERENCE OF MATERIAL SUBMITTED ON A
       COMPACT DISC (See 37 CFR 1.52(e)(5) and MPEP 608.05. Computer
       program listings (37 CFR 1.96(c)), "Sequence Listings" (37 CFR 1.821(c)),
       and tables having more than 50 pages of text are permitted to be
       submitted on compact discs.) or
       REFERENCE TO A "MICROFICHE APPENDIX" (See MPEP § 608.05(a).
       "Microfiche Appendices" were accepted by the Office until March 1, 2001.)
(e) BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION.
       (1) Field of the Invention.
       (2) Description of Related Art including information disclosed under 37
       CFR 1.97 and 1.98.
(f) BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION.
(g) BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE SEVERAL VIEWS OF THE DRAWING(S).
(h) DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE INVENTION.
(i) CLAIM OR CLAIMS (commencing on a separate sheet).
(j) ABSTRACT OF THE DISCLOSURE (commencing on a separate sheet).
(k) SEQUENCE LISTING (See MPEP § 2424 and 37 CFR 1.821-1.825. A
       "Sequence Listing" is required on paper if the application discloses a
       nucleotide or amino acid sequence as defined in 37 CFR 1.821(a) and if
       the required "Sequence Listing" is not submitted as an electronic
       document on compact disc).

Claim Objections

6.   Claims 6, 10, 22, 46, 49, 51, 53 and 65 are objected to because of the following

informalities: claims have a number of misspelled words. Appropriate correction is

required. The details are as follows:

Claim 6:   corrected as "descriptor" miss-spelled as "desriptor"

Claim 10:   corrected as "identified" miss-spelled as "identifed"

Claim 10:   corrected as "identified" miss-spelled as "identifed"

Claim 10:   corrected as "version" miss-spelled as "verion"

Claim 22:   corrected as "descriptor"   miss-spelled as "desriptor"

Claim 46:   corrected as "article"   miss-spelled as "artcile"

Claim 49:   corrected as "descriptor"   miss-spelled as "desriptor"

Claim 51:   corrected as "article"   miss-spelled as "artcile"

Claim 53:   corrected as "identifier"   miss-spelled as "identifer"

Claim 53:   corrected as "version"   miss-spelled as "verion"

Claim 53:   corrected as "identified"   miss-spelled as "identifed"

Claim 53:   corrected as "information"   miss-spelled as "infromation"

Claim 65:   corrected as "descriptor"   miss-spelled as "desriptor"

7.   Claims 44-68 are objected to because claims recites the limitation "the article of manufacture" in line 1 of claims 44-68. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

8.   Claims 1, 7, 44 and 50 are objected to because the second limitation contains "performance consideration" and it needs more explanation in order to take into account a specific measure of performance. Examiner interpreted as performing a function/service for examining the application with reference to the specification on page 1, paragraph [0020].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
>
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
>
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
>
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
>
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
>
>   This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims
>
> under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was
>
> commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the
>
> contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and
>
> invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in
>
> order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e),
>
> (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

10.   Claims 1-5, 7, 17-21, 44-48, 50, 60-64 and 67-68 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Spencer et al. ("Installing and Configuring

Active Directory", Prentice Hall PTR, May 2000) hereinafter Spencer, and in view of

Underwood (US Patent 6,633,878) hereinafter Underwood.

11.   As per independent claims 1, 44, Spencer teaches a method of seamless

integration with both internet and intranet environment, simple, intuitive naming for

objects it contains, scalability from a small business to the largest enterprise,

interoperability with tools that users already use, such as Web browsers and simple,

powerful open application programming interfaces (page 4). Spencer teaches the

claimed step of "determining if a first application provides a first function/service to

which first data stored in a first data set are associated; if so, generating a first

application provides a first function/service to which first data stored in a first data set

are associated for performance consideration" as windows 2000 tightly integrates active

directory and offers traditional file and print applications, communications, and

internet/intranet support in the base product. Active directory makes it the best file and

print server for all information resources sharing needs. As an example, the first data

set is Headquarters, the first operation is delegating access control and the first

function/service is easy administration through drag and drop commands and wizards

(Fig. 2-4, page 4-5). Performing the service of delegation of access control to

headquarters personnel is done for easy administration. As another example, first

application as print server and the first service as printing and first data set as the

properties of the printer, for example, the persons authorized to use specific printer

based on the controls set at the time of the print server setup. Spencer does not

explicitly teach the performance consideration. However, Underwood teaches "the

performance consideration" as rather than making raw LDAP calls to the Membership

Directory, Site Server Membership uses Active Directory Service Interfaces, better

known as ADSI. ADSI provides a common standard interface to multiple directory

services (through ADSI providers) and communicates with the directory services using

LDAP. ADSI makes life easier by allowing the developer to write code to one API while

working with multiple directory services (col.138, lines 30-38). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the data processing art a t the time of the invention, to have combined the teachings of the cited references because Underwood's teachings would have allowed Spencer's method provides a centralized integration point to bring diverse systems together and consolidating directories and management tasks. Further more, performance consideration as taught by Underwood improves to provide the Active User Object (AUO) as a single component that aggregates all of a user's attributes from multiple Active Directory Service (ADS) providers (col. 138, lines 40-42).

12.   As per dependent claims 2, 45, Underwood teaches the claimed step of "examining a plurality of data subscription statements of said first application, and determining if any of the data subscription statements specifies said first application as being a subscriber of data associated with said first function/service" as import the newly modified data into the new data store (col. 96, lines 56-59). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the data processing art a t the time of the invention, to combine the teachings of the cited references because Underwood's teachings would have allowed Spencer's method provides a centralized integration point to bring diverse systems together and consolidating directories and management tasks. Further more, performance consideration as taught by Underwood improves to provide the Active User Object (AUO) as a single component that aggregates all of a user's attributes from multiple Active Directory Service (ADS) providers (col. 138, lines 40-42).

13.   As per dependent claims 3, 46, Spencer teaches the claimed step of

"function/service to which said data subscribed to by said first application are

associated, as well as function/service to which said first data stored in said first dataset

are associated, are both expressed in term of a first cross application function/service

classification of a cross application function/service based data classification model" as

Active directory shown in the fig.1 is classified. Active directory has APIs integrated into

its code that allow communication with other directories and can exchange information

with any application or directory that has LDAP or other X.500 protocols including DAP,

DSP and DISP (Fig.1, 6, page 8).

14.   As per dependent claims 4, 47, Underwood teaches the claimed step of "first

cross application function/service classification is in a form of an encoded binary

representation" as the name service creates a logical name in place of a binary machine

number (col. 113, lines 31-36). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill

in the data processing art a t the time of the invention, to combine the teachings of the

cited references because Underwood's teachings would have allowed Spencer's

method provides a centralized integration point to bring diverse systems together and

consolidating directories and management tasks. Further more, performance

consideration as taught by Underwood improves to provide the Active User Object

(AUO) as a single component that aggregates all of a user's attributes from multiple

Active Directory Service (ADS) providers (col. 138, lines 40-42).

15.   As per dependent claims 5, 48, Underwood teaches the claimed step of "the

method further comprises retrieving said data subscription statements of said first

application" as import the newly modified data into the new data store (col. 96, lines 56-

59). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the data processing art

a t the time of the invention, to combine the teachings of the cited references because

Underwood's teachings would have allowed Spencer's method provides a centralized

integration point to bring diverse systems together and consolidating directories and

management tasks. Further more, performance consideration as taught by Underwood

improves to provide the Active User Object (AUO) as a single component that

aggregates all of a user's attributes from multiple Active Directory Service (ADS)

providers (col. 138, lines 40-42).

16.   As per dependent claims 7, 50, Spencer teaches the claimed step of

"determining if a second application also provides said first function/service to which

said first data stored in said first data set are associated and if so, generating a second

candidate operation that distributes said first data stored in said first data set into said

second application for performance consideration" first application as print server and

the first service as printing and first data set as the properties of the printer, for example,

the persons authorized to use specific printer based on the controls set at the time of

the print server setup (page 5).

17.   As per dependent claims 17, 60, Spencer teaches the claimed step of
"determining if said first application provides a second function/service to which second
data stored in a second data set are associated, and if so, generating a second
candidate operation that distributes said second data stored in said second data set into
said first application for performance consideration" as windows 2000 tightly integrates
active directory and offers traditional file and print applications, communications, and
internet/intranet support in the base product. Active directory makes it the best file and
print server for all information resources sharing needs (Fig. 2-4, page 4-5).

18.   As per dependent claims 18, 61, Spencer teaches the claimed step of "first data
comprises control data usable to control operation of said first application" first
application as print server and the first service as printing and first data set as the
properties of the printer, for example, the persons authorized to use specific printer˙
based on the controls set at the time of the print server setup. The control data like
paper size allowed using in the printer is also controlled (page 5).

19.   As per dependent claims 19, 62, Spencer teaches the claimed step of "first data
comprises user data consumable using said first application" the user data paper size is
a control data and a usable consumer data (page 5).

20.   As per dependent claims 20, 63, Spencer teaches the claimed step of "the

method further comprises discovering presence of said first application" the print

application can be determined while setting a printer on the print server (page 5).

21.   As per dependent claims 21, 64, Spencer teaches the claimed step of

"discovering comprises retrieving a plurality of presence criteria of said first application"

as while setting a printer through a using a print server the presence criteria could be a

location of the printer (page5).

22.   As per dependent claim 67, Underwood teaches the claimed "said article and

said apparatus are one of the same, and said article/apparatus further comprises at

least one processor coupled to the storage medium to execute the programming

instructions" as disk storage medium (Fig. 1.1, col. 11, lines 21-22). Thus, it would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the data processing art a t the time of the

invention, to have combined the teachings of the cited references because

Underwood's teachings would have allowed Spencer's method provides a centralized

integration point to bring diverse systems together and consolidating directories and

management tasks. Further more, performance consideration as taught by Underwood

improves to provide the Active User Object (AUO) as a single component that

aggregates all of a user's attributes from multiple Active Directory Service (ADS)

providers (col. 138, lines 40-42).

23.   As per dependent claim 68, Underwood teaches the claimed "said

article/apparatus is a selected one of a wireless mobile phone, a palm sized computing

device, a notebook sized computing device, a desktop computing device, a set-top box

and a server" as a typical hardware of a workstation (Fig. 1.1, col. 11, lines 16-17).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the data processing art a t

the time of the invention, to have combined the teachings of the cited references

because Underwood's teachings would have allowed Spencer's method provides a

centralized integration point to bring diverse systems together and consolidating

directories and management tasks. Further more, performance consideration as taught

by Underwood improves to provide the Active User Object (AUO) as a single

component that aggregates all of a user's attributes from multiple Active Directory

Service (ADS) providers (col. 138, lines 40-42).

Allowable Subject Matter

24.   Claims 6, 8-16, 22-23, 49, 51-59 and 65-66 are objected to as being dependent

upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form

including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sathyanarayan Pannala whose telephone number is (571) 272-4115. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 am - 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene can be reached on (571) 272-4107. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Sathyanarayan Pannala
Examiner
Art Unit 2167

srp
September 30, 2005